



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/751,974	12/29/2000	Hiroyo Masuda	FUJS 18.150	9067	
75	90 10/05/2005	EXAMINER			
Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman			LE, NHAN T		
575 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10022-2585			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
New Tork, 141	10022-2303		2685	2685	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/751,974	MASUDA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Nhan T. Le	2685		

		Nhan T. Le	2685	
The MAILING DATE of	this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 23 June 2005			•	
 The reply was filed after a finathis application, applicant muplaces the application in conda Request for Continued Exatime periods: 	al rejection, but prior to or or st timely file one of the follov dition for allowance; (2) a No	n the same day as filing a No wing replies: (1) an amendmo ntice of Appeal (with appeal fo	tice of Appeal. To avoid aba ent, affidavit, or other evider ee) in compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) 🔯 The period for reply expires	3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
no event, however, will the s Examiner Note: If box 1 is c	tatutory period for reply expire	Advisory Action, or (2) the date s ater than SIX MONTHS from the (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WH 06.07(f).	e mailing date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained un have been filed is the date for purposes under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any may reduce any earned patent term ad NOTICE OF APPEAL	of determining the period of ex n: (1) the expiration date of the eply received by the Office late	tension and the corresponding a shortened statutory period for re r than three months after the ma	amount of the fee. The appropr ply originally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was file filing the Notice of Appeal (37 a Notice of Appeal has been 	CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37	'(e)), to avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of the appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS				
 The proposed amendment(s (a) ☐ They raise new issues (b) ☐ They raise the issue of 	that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (s		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to appeal; and/or	o place the application in be	tter form for appeal by mater		the issues for
	7 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	-		
4. \square The amendments are not in \circ			Ion-Compliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overco				
6. Newly proposed or amended non-allowable claim(s).				
7. For purposes of appeal, the how the new or amended cla The status of the claim(s) is (Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:	ims would be rejected is pro or will be) as follows:		□ will be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from con- AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENC				
 The affidavit or other evidence because applicant failed to p was not earlier presented. S 	e filed after a final action, burovide a showing of good andee 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the	affidavit or other evidence i	s necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence entered because the affidavit showing a good and sufficient 	or other evidence failed to a treasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections unde y and was not earlier presen	r appeal and/or appellant fa ited. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evider REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERAT	ION/OTHER			
 The request for reconsidera (see attached). 				nce because:
 Note the attached Information Other: 	on Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) F	Paper No(s)	

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 06/23/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 20-21, Applicant argues that applicant admitted prior art fails to teach the mobile service switching center comprising determining section for determining whether a call request is a call from the first multi-call communication mode supporting terminal or from the single-call communication mode supporting terminal; event detecting section for detecting event caused by a handover occurrence or fluctuation of congested state of a network, by reception of a handover requesting signal or an increase of a load representing the congested state of the network; and call-number changing section for increasing or decreasing to change the number of continuing calls of the first multi-call communication mode supporting terminal which is determined by the determining section, when an event is detected by the event detecting section detects any event during the communication. The examiner disagrees. The applicant admitted prior art teaches the mobile service switching center comprising determining section for determining whether a call request is a call from the first multi-call communication mode supporting terminal or from the single-call communication mode supporting terminal (see page 3, lines 1-11, page 4, lines 9-27, page 5, 1-5); event detecting section for detecting event caused by a handover occurrence or fluctuation of congested state of a network, by reception of a handover requesting signal or an increase of a load representing the congested state of the network(see page 5, line 23Application/Control Number: 09/751,974 Page 3

Art Unit: 2685

page 6, line 2); and call-number changing section for increasing or decreasing to change the number of continuing calls of the first multi-call communication mode supporting terminal which is determined by the determining section, when an event is detected by the event detecting section detects any event during the communication (see page 6, lines 3-13).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhan T. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-7892. The examiner can normally be reached on 08:00-05:00 (Mon-Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on 571-272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

1.0,00

Nhan Le

NGUYENT.VO